DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 541 CS 003 643

AUTHOR Palmatier, Robert A., Ed.
TITLE [Issues in the Education of Reading Teachers.]
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 17p.
JOURNAL CIT Epistle; v4 n2 Entire Issue Spr 1977

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Practice; *Educational Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Instruction; Higher Education; Performance Based Education; *Professional Associations; Program Design; Questionnaires; *Reading; *Reading Instruction; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This issue collects articles concerning the education of reading teachers. Deborah Osen Hancock and Jack Jones provide "California Professors of Reading: An Organization in the Process of Becoming," an article describing the role of the California Association of College Professors of Reading in teacher certification and program design. In "Attending to the Positive Outcomes of CBTE While Pleading for No Mandate," Richard L. Allington calls for a fair appraisal of competency-based and field-based training in reading. "What Are the Important Issues? A Referendum of Reading Professionals," by Robert A. Palmatier, S. Kemble Oliver, and Richard L. Allington, asks readers to provide their responses to 15 specific issues ranging from the definition of content-area reading to the role of the International Reading Association in teacher certification. (KS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146541

[Issues in the Education of Reading Teachers.]

Volume 4, No. 2 Spring 1977

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EPISTLE

The Publication Forum of
Professors of Reading Teacher Educators
A Special Interest Group of the
International Reading Association

Contents

California Professors of Reading: An Organization in the Process of Becoming
Deborah Osen Hancock and Jack Jones

Attending to the Positive Outcomes of CBTE While Pleading for No Mandate
Richard Allington

What are the Important Issues? A Referendum of Reading Professionals
Robert A. Palmatier, S. Kemble Oliver and Richard L. Allington

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

International
Reading Association

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CS 003 643

Debbie Hancock is a professor and director of the Institute for Reading at California State University at Fullerton. Jack Jones, current president of California Professors of Reading, is an associate professor at California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo.

CALIFORNIA PROFESSORS OF READING: AN ORGANIZATION IN THE PROCESS OF BECOMING

Deborah Osen Hancock
Jack Jones

Can professors of Reading from rival institutions within the same state work together in a professional organization of their peers? The California Professors of Reading (CPR) demonstrates that it can be done. How CPR developed as an organization may be of interest to professors who don't currently have a state organization. Professors involved already in such a organization may find some of the current activities of the California Professors of Reading of interest as they plan future activities.

CURRENT ACTIVITIES

With the present membership in excess of 100, the California Professors of Reading represents a cross section of the public and private sectors of higher education in the state. Members from the University of California system, the California State Colleges and Universities and over 25 private institutions of higher education participate in the activities of the organization.

A special interest group of the California Reading Association, CPR holds its annual meeting each November in conjunction with the California Reading Association conference. At this meeting the entire body of CPR comes together to conduct elections and other business in the interest of the association. Because of the size of the state, Fall and Spring conferences are also held in both the Northern and Southern regions to accommodate members.

The California Professors of Reading organization projects the philosophy of inservice for its members, service to public school educators, and advocacy of legislation which furthers the causes of literacy and effective reading instruction. During the recent Fall conference of the Northern region in October, for example, a panel discussion was conducted at which time the members discussed activities and projected future directions of CPR. Dr. Herb Simons from the University of California, Berkeley, shared the results of his research on Black dialect and provided insights into this current topic of interest. Similarly, the Southern regional conference held at Whittier College provided an opportunity for participants to discuss learning models for preservice instruction, followed by a presentation by a member who had spent the last two years providing inservice education for Brazilian teachers of reading.

Several major activities have been undertaken this year in the interest of the goals of the organization. One task has been to collect and edit the papers presented at the California Reading Association's annual conference and publish them as a service to educators. Secondly, CPR has formed a speaker's bureau which will be presented in the form of a list of members who are available to speak on specific topics to school districts, local councils of the International Reading Association, and parent or civic groups.

A third major task in which CPR will be involved this year deals with external assessment of programs leading to the Reading Specialist credential, currently in operation in colleges and universities throughout the state and which are state-approved. Official recognition by the California Teacher Preparation and Licensing Commission of the California Professors of Reading as a constituency group allows its members to serve as a pool from which the State may draw for external assessment teams. These teams will act much in the vein of an accreditation team for the purposes of insuring that institutions of higher learning are fulfilling their obligations as prescribed under the current legislation affecting teacher education.

Approximately three issues of the newsletter will appear during this academic year. It serves as a forum for creative thought, communication, and a sharing of ideas and concerns.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CPR

The germ of the idea to form a Professors of Reading Special Interest Group of the state organization came into existence at

the California Reading Association conference held in Anaheim, California in November, 1972. Professors from throughout the state expressed concern about developing local university plans for implementing a new Ryan Act credentialling system. This Act established a Reading Specialist credential for the first time in California and universities were urged to submit programs for State approval which met broad, general guidelines supplied by the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Commission. It was apparent that great discrepancy existed in the plans proposed to the various universities. A statewide organization of professors was suggested at this time as one means for providing communication about the new credentials which were being developed.

In January, 1973 a statewide meeting of interested professors was held at California State University, Fullerton. Addressing the group, Dr. Margaret Lynch, CRA president and herself a professor of Reading, urged the group to organize formally as a special interest group of the California Reading Association. She suggested that with such an organization professors of Reading could (1) increase communication between professors concerning the new credentialling programs, (2) have a greater impact on the future of reading instruction in the state, and (3) increase the opportunities for inservice education among professionals in the field. The group voted to ask CRA for special interest group status, and elected eight of the attendees as its Board of Directors.

That spring the group was officially recognized as a special interest group of the California Reading Association. At the first CPR executive board meeting held later that semester at California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo the Board wrestled with questions which faced the organization: Who are we? Where are we going? How are we going to get there? The major outgrowth of this meeting was the development of a proposed Constitution, as well as the establishment of dues ($5.00 per year--CRA felt that they should not be higher than the highest local council dues) and a meeting schedule (two regional conferences annually, held in both the northern and southern parts of the state, an annual business meeting during the state CRA conference and three executive board meetings annually). In addition a newsletter was established and a membership campaign initiated.

At the fall regional conferences, the proposed Constitution was presented and possible revisions discussed. Nominations for the 1974-75 executive board were solicited. Inservice

activities included progress reports on the development of credentials under the Ryan Act.

At the annual business meeting in November, 1973 the Constitution was adopted and the Board of Directors elected. The members reviewed reports by Board members of presentations made on behalf of the organization at public hearing on the new credentials and the proposed California Framework in Reading. A job-alike session for professors was also included in the state conference as was a special pre-conference workshop for Professors of Reading.

The schedule of conferences and meetings adopted at the first executive board meeting has continued to be followed. These meetings have resulted in the development of Legislative, Membership, Nominating, Regional Conference Planning, and Inservice Exchange committees. CPR has also published a monograph of presentations to its organization by such renowned educators as Margaret Early and Millard Black. Inservice presentations have taken various forms as members identified two major concerns: current research findings in the field of reading and methods of improving pre- and inservice training of reading teachers/specialists.

CONCLUSIONS

California Professors of Reading is a young organization, having been in existence for only four years. It has addressed itself to many of the challenges facing teacher educators in Reading. It is continuing to adapt the new needs as they arise. As such it will always be in the process of "becoming" an organization called the California Professors of Reading.

Persons interested in receiving a sample copy of CPR's Constitution or Newsletter may contact Dr. Julie Chan, CPR Newsletter Editor, 1741 Park Ave. #26, Long Beach, CA 90815 Please enclose a stamped, self-addressed manila envelope. (Regrettably, a limited budget makes this request necessary.) Information about ordering the monograph may also be obtained from Dr. Chan.

Richard Allington is an associate professor in the reading department of The University at Albany, New York

ATTENDING TO THE POSITIVE OUTCOMES OF CBTE WHILE PLEADING FOR NO MANDATE*

Richard Allington

Only a short time ago an argument extolling the virtues of competency based teacher education (CBTE) would have been warmly received. Today, however, it seems more fashionable to attack the concept as empirically unproven, pedagogically unsound, and patently unhumanistic. Proponents counter with the strawman; competency based vs. incompetency based teacher education. Regardless of which camp the one is aligned with, CBTE needs to be examined in light of some of its positive results while not losing sight of current limitations.

SOME POSITIVE OUTCOMES

Competency based teacher education was conceived and nurtured as a result of recurrent criticism of traditional teacher training from both internal and external sources. The accountability movement in the public schools also provided impetus. As classroom teachers felt pressure to provide evidence of performance, they concurrently began questioning the rationale underlying the concept. For them to be held accountable surely provided the right to expect a minimum level of teaching competence as a result of their professional preparation. Teacher

---

*Portions of this paper were presented to the Commissioners Task Force on Competency Based Teacher Education, Albany, New York, April 14, 1976.

trainers had long been aware that traditional assessment procedures demonstrated no correlation with teaching ability and that perhaps traditional teacher preparation programs concomitantly demonstrated little correlation with the development of teaching effectiveness, (Shea, 1955; Barr, 1961; Walberg, 1967; Allington and Erwin, 1976). For many, CBTE offered the promise of change for the better. One should question though, whether CBTE in its still young life has lived up to the expectations. What has the movement accomplished?

A primary influence of the CBTE movement has been a re-emphasis on the performance aspect of teacher training curricula. While not ignoring cognitive components of teacher preparation, CBTE proponents have argued that knowledge alone is not, in and of itself, a desirable outcome of professional preparation, (Allen, 1966; Allington, 1974; Dodl, 1973). Traditionally, student teaching was the performance component of teacher training. It was found lacking in a variety of ways, not the least of which was the evaluation process, which when employed was generally summative in nature. Competency based curricula have disseminated new modes of performance assessment. Experimentation and validation efforts with innovative modes of training and evaluation such as role-playing, micro-teaching, mini-lesson, and simulated instructional decision making, have altered the traditional lecture format of coursework at many institutions. The CBTE movement has resulted in the refurbishment and redesign of teacher preparation curricula nationally.

Renewed research efforts on both the teaching process and teacher training curricula have been a direct outgrowth of the CBTE movement. At no time in education has more research been conducted in these areas. While still in its infancy, CBTE pointed to the paucity of available empirical support for much of the basic theoretical foundation of teacher training. Today, too, a large gap exists between research and practice but it is being steadily narrowed, spurred on by individuals on the forefront of the CBTE issue. Opponents have validly argued that proponents have too often placed development, based on intuition and logic, ahead of determined research efforts. However, traditional teacher preparation efforts were, likewise, seldom supported by an empirical base. Thus the argument, while well taken, seems to lack validity. More important than the validity of the argument are the questions raised. A research base is needed and the criticism has stimulated efforts in that direction.

A further benefit of the CBTE movement is the trend toward cooperative efforts in teacher preparation. Traditionally, teacher

education has been the responsibility of university faculty; within this group there has often been too little cooperation. Even fewer collaborative efforts were established among other professionals involved in teacher training. Teacher trainers have too long ignored input from the publics they serve. The "ivory tower" was often an accurate depiction of the vacuum surrounding the Schools of Education. Cooperation within these institutions and the development of consortia to foster cooperative action with those outside the "ivory tower" has been another direct outgrowth of CBTE. These efforts can only result in more comprehensive teacher training curricula with opportunities for expanded experience components along the lines of internships, directed field experiences, and practica.

Perhaps the future will record the discussion generated by CBTE as its primary contribution to the professional preparation of educators. The renewed emphasis on performance, versus knowledge, would currently seem the primary contribution. This, coupled with the research, experimentation, exploration, and cooperation seem to point to the overwhelmingly positive aspects of the CBTE movement.

SOME LIMITATIONS

Detractors raise many valid issues, but the competency based movement suffers primarily from disciples too eager to modularize the easiest components at the cognitive level while neglecting the establishment of empirical support for such. If we are to significantly improve the level of teaching competence, research and development must be pursued vigorously. Regardless of the acronym selected, teacher training can and must be improved but CBTE is not necessarily the most valid nor convenient vehicle.

A most disconcerting phenomenon is to listen and discover that a new CBTE curriculum is substantively no different that its predecessor. Beware of the illusion, for as John Dewey warned, "The real danger is in perpetuating the past under forms that claim to be new but are only disguises of the old," (Dewey, 1952). In fact, some of the current CBTE curricula are probably weaker than their predecessor. Some institutions adopting a so-called CBTE curricula have offered course credit for simply filling out a number of materials evaluation forms - forms which ask only for trivial pieces of information such as publisher, cost, grade level designation, format, design, attractiveness, etc. No formal instruction in evaluation of materials from either a theoretical or pedagogical point of view is presented. Thus, the students receive credit for basically perusing the shelves of a materials

center. Another example is the granting of credit for unsupervised field experiences in which the student spends time in a school classroom, purportedly to work with children, perhaps in reading instruction. However, the unsupervised nature of this participation leaves the student as open to identify with poor instructional techniques as to learn about techniques which teacher educators would suggest and/or support. Further, in some instances the student actually receives little "hands on" experience but either simply observes or serves as a teacher aide correcting workbooks, running dittos, etc. Experience with children is a valid component of a teacher education curriculum, but the student must have numerous instances of guidance in making formative evaluations in order to develop into a competent educator.

Many examples of modularization of the easiest components of a teacher cirrucula are available. Unfortunately the components which seem the easiest to modularize may be the least important. For instance, while it is relatively simple to develop objective criteria for the mastery of some skills (running a movie projector, administering and scoring an achievement test, calculating a readability level, etc.) for other skills objective criteria cannot be easily generated (developing and delivering an instructional unit, developing an accurate assessment of student achievement, or diagnosing a student's reading difficulty). Further, the philosophical and theoretical issues underlying decisions involved in all of the above activities have too rarely been addressed in CBTE programs. Thus, the greatest limitation of modularized CBTE seems to be its overwhelming "answer orientation." That is, neat little packages which provide ready "answers" without concurrently forcing the student to question the underlying philosophy or theory from which the "answers" flow.

The "package" concept of CBTE seems to sell the teacher short. It perpetuates what Frank Smith (1974) calls the "malaise of ignorance in education." Specifically, CBTE serves to support "soft-core" ignorance, or the need to be told what to do and how to do it. Teacher education should not focus on what teachers should do but rather on what they need to know to decide for themselves. CBTE has offered little hope for developing this kind of teacher. Rather, the underlying rationale of CBTE seems to mitigate against this goal by attempting to objectively identify what kinds of knowledge, skills, and attitudes, a teacher must have (in short, what kind of persons). This brings us back to the question raised in Skinner's Walden Two: Who decides what kind of person?

NO MANDATE PLEASE

Although willing to let others, who feel they can (and should), specify what a teacher must know, be able to do, etc., this author is unhappy about the possibility of being required to submit to the CBTE or any other philosophy of teacher training and education. The use of certain skills oriented modules and the development of courses guided by the question: "What do I want them to know and be able to do?" are CBTE concepts used regularly by this writer. However, when asked to design instruction which identifies what teacher candidates should believe, feel, or think this professor faces philosophical conflict. That is indoctrination, not education. Rather that be programmed to parrot stipulated methods, attitudes, materials, and other instructional factors, preservice teachers must be trained to understand human development, learning, instructional goals, and other factors which affect student learning. The understanding of various methods and materials will then proceed with a focus upon - Why? - at every step. It is this need for understanding "why" particular methods and materials are appropriate, for certain teachers in certain settings given certain student learning objectives and learner characteristics, which cannot be modularized in the current CBTE format.

CBTE has had positive outcomes but it also has inherent limitations. These limitations are so serious that they threaten to undermine the education of educators by substituting the perpetuation and proliferation of "soft-core" ignorance. We need competent educators but competency beyond the development of technical skills. Unfortunately, CBTE, as currently formulated, cannot meet the challenge. To meet this need educators must continue through research and experimentation, to develop CBTE and other approaches beyond current levels. And, educators must be free to continue experimentation, without a mandate to adopt any single educational concept, in order to continue seeking improved instructional strategies.

REFERENCES

Allen, Dwight. "A New Design for Teacher Education: The Teacher Intern Program at Stanford University," Journal of Teacher Education, 17:3 (Fall, 1966) pp. 296-300.

Allington, Richard. "A Comparison of Taped Micro-Teaching Performance and Teacher Test Achievement," Improving Human Performance, 5:1, 1976.

Allington, Richard. "A Rationale for the Competency Based Education of Reading Teachers," Journal of Reading, 17:7 April, 1974.

Barr, A. S. "Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness: A Summary of the Investigations," Journal of Experimental Education, 30, September, 1961. pp. 1-66.

Dewey, John. "Introduction to The Use of Resources in Education" by E. R. Clapp, New York: Harper and Row, 1952. Reprinted in M. Dworkin (ed.), Dewey on Education, New York: Teachers College Press, 1959.

Dodl, Norman. "Program Evaluation and Pupil Assessment," in Cooper and DeNault (eds.), Competency Based Teacher Education, Berkley: McCutchan, 1973.

Shea, Joan. "The Predictive Value of Various Combinations of Standardized Tests and Subtests for Prognosis of Teaching Efficiency," Education Research Monograph, 19:6, Washington D.C.: Catholic University, 1955.

Skinner, B. F. Walden Two, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1948, p. 8.

Smith, Frank. "The Politics of Ignorance" in Winhjokam (ed.), The Politics of Reading, International Reading Association, 1974.

Walberg, H. J. "Scholastic Aptitude, the National Teacher Examination, and Teaching Success," Journal of Educational Research, 1:3, November, 1967, pp. 129-131.

Bob Palmatier, Kemble Oliver and Dick Allington have been continually involved with EPISTLE since some of the earliest issues. Allington teaches at the University at Albany, while Palmatier is on the faculty at the University of Georgia. Oliver coordinates the school reading program in Clarke County, Georgia.

What Are the Important Issues? A Referendum of Reading Professionals

Robert A. Palmatier
S. Kemble Oliver
Richard L. Allington

During a meeting of the three authors and Charles Peters, another editorial advisor, it was decided that EPISTLE needed more direction from its readers. Thus, the idea to poll readers on the issues they would like to see considered in future issues emerged. Through discussion and later preparation of lists, the participants arrived at a series of issues which they felt covered many of the concerns of reading professionals. This list is presented below in an inquiry format. Readers who wish to respond to any of the questions raised are encouraged to prepare articles for future issues of EPISTLE. In cases where great interest emerges an entire issue might be devoted to a single topic.

While it is hoped that confrontation with these questions will provoke readers to prepare position papers, the immediate goal is to establish priorites for selection of EPISTLE articles and activities of the Professors of Reading Teacher Educators Special Interest Group. Thus, each reader is asked to respond to the questionnaire by ranking, according to personal opinion, the priority level deserved by each issue raised. The response form should be returned to the editor prior to July 1, 1977 so that the responses may be tallied for report in the Fall issue. In addition to evaluating each issue please indicate individuals

who might prepare an article on any of the topics. Do not hesitate to volunteer yourself.

THE ISSUES

#1 Should doctoral education/preparation be focused on producing persons to fill certain occupational slots? In other words, do we risk losing the traditional emphasis on developing scholars? Should we?

#2 Are there differences between the Doctor of Education and the Doctor of Philosophy in Education degrees? Should one be a professional degree with an emphasis on professional competencies in education and the other with an emphasis on developing educational scholars/researchers?

#3 Is experience more valuable than a good theory? Should reading "expertize" be justifiable only if an individual has a record of successful teaching experience in the area and at the level where "expertize" is claimed.

#4 Is remedial reading the only area where federal support is available or needed? Can monies designated for the gifted, science education, math education, social studies education, ecology, mental health, the elderly, and other areas of current concern be applied for and secured by reading professionals? Do we have knowledge to offer and services to give in these areas?

#5 Do these individuals holding leadership positions in reading have sufficient qualifications in "reading"? In numerous cases it appears that administrative jobs go first to applicants with administrative experience rather than to candidates who have strong qualifications in the area in which leadership is to be exerted, <u>reading</u>. Is this a nationwide problem and how can it be solved? Basic to the issue is a study of what is essential training in reading? If the possession of a doctorate in reading were to be set as the criteria for most positions in reading only few of those individuals now providing professional leadership in reading would qualify.

#6 Who lobbies for effective legislation in reading? Do we have the proper organizational format and approach to win support for needed legislative support? Perhaps reading people need to include parents in an organization which is

more "interest area" oriented than professional. This approach seems to have worked well for the exceptional children people.

#7 What are the job alternatives available to and the competecies expected of reading graduates? Do we know the skills and training background expected for employment in industry, publishing, government, and other non-teacher education and school positions? The concept of "competency for what?" must be superimposed upon our enthusiastic generation of competency statements.

#8 Many professors serve as authors of reading materials and have written textbooks. What is involved in being a part-time publishing company employee or editorial advisor? How does this differ from authoring a text book? And how do professors of reading become involved and/or learn about publishers' criteria for selection of authors?

#9 How is the field of reading education viewed by others (e.g. legislators, citizens, college of education deans, etc.)? Do they understand the field, respect reading professionals, have unfilled expectations of reading specialists, or have other ideas about reading we should be cognizant?

#10 Are the guidelines established for federally funded programs involving reading consistent with what we know about the "best" approaches to teaching reading? Since almost no variation is allowed in many programs it seems appropriate that the policies be examined by reading professionals to determine their relationship to present knowledge of instructional approaches and the relative benefits to various sorts of children.

#11 Does competency based/field based teacher education designate the role of teachers by focusing on method while disregarding understanding? Are we producing teachers who know "what" to teach and "how" it is supposed to be taught but not "why?" Does this matter?

#12 Should universities attempts to include courses essential for certification in graduate programs? In other words, should certification and degree requirements be essentially identical?

#13 What is content area reading? Is it a new method for teaching children to read within the context of a particular subject

area, like science? Or is it a collection of methods recommended to content teachers for getting around student reading handicaps such that the desired subject matter is learned by students? Or???

#14 Should the International Reading Association develop accreditation standards and procedures for certifying graduate degree programs and individuals trained in reading along the lines of the APA? If so, what criteria should be established for programs and for individual certification?

#15 Other areas of concern where attention is needed?_____

_____

_____

PLEASE RETURN RESPONSE FORM BY JULY 1

PLEASE REACT!

Complete the response form on next page, remove, and mail to:

Dr. Robert A. Palmatier
309 Aderhold Building
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

RESPONSE FORM

Directions: For each of the issues presented in the article "What are the Important Issues? A Referendum of Reading Professionals" designate a priority level. Using your own judgement, circle a position for each item on the following five point scale: 1 = a critical concern; 2 = an important concern; 3 = a topic of interest; 4 = a topic of little concern; 5 = an irrelevant topic. If you have knowledge of someone who should be asked to address any of the topics in EPISTLE articles please designate that persons name in the space after the question. Feel free to volunteer yourself.

#1.....	1	2	3	4	5
#2.....	1	2	3	4	5
#3.....	1	2	3	4	5
#4.....	1	2	3	4	5
#5.....	1	2	3	4	5
#6.....	1	2	3	4	5
#7.....	1	2	3	4	5
#8.....	1	2	3	4	5
#9.....	1	2	3	4	5
#10.....	1	2	3	4	5
#11.....	1	2	3	4	5
#12.....	1	2	3	4	5
#13.....	1	2	3	4	5
#14.....	1	2	3	4	5
#15.. (specify below).....	1	2	3	4	5

_____

_____

Please return by July 1, to:

Dr. Robert A. Palmatier
309 Aderhold Building
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602